Exhibit F

- - -

IN RE: PELVIC MESH/GYNECARE LITIGATION

:SUPERIOR COURT OF
:NEW JERSEY
:LAW DIVISION -
:ATLANTIC COUNTY
:
:MASTER CASE 6341-10
:
:CASE NO. 291 CT

CONFIDENTIAL-SUBJECT TO STIPULATION AND ORDER OF CONFIDENTIALITY

- - -

May 18, 2012

- - -

Transcript of the deposition of SEAN M. O'BRYAN, called for Videotaped Examination in the above-captioned matter, said deposition taken pursuant to Superior Court Rules of Practice and Procedure by and before Maryellen Coughlin, a Certified Realtime Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and Notary Public for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at the offices of Campbell Campbell Edwards & Conroy, P.C., One Constitution Center, 3rd Floor, Boston, Massachusetts, commencing at 10:05 a.m.

- - -

GOLKOW TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
877.370.3377 ph| 917.951.5672 fax
deps@golkow.com

warnings that a patient could be faced with that are important for the patient.

Q. And to the extent you had input into the Prolift® IFU drafting process, you certainly wanted to make sure that any warnings of any significant potential risks would be explicitly communicated to the intended or foreseeable users of the Prolift®, correct?

MS. KABBASH: Objection.

A. Sure. I rely on the medical team to tell me what is significant and what is important to convey into the instructions for use, package insert.

Q. When you worked on that project, it was your understanding from an FDA regulatory perspective it would not be legitimate to not include warnings of potentially significant adverse events based on a decision that the surgeons would figure that out on their own?

MS. KABBASH: Objection.

A. No, that's correct.

Q. Would you turn to Page 22, please. It's Paragraph D, D.1.3. The question is asked, "Do the results of the design validation performed as a result of this change in materials